

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/701,495	1	1/06/2003	Jean-Baptiste Galey	232979US0	7627	
22850	7590 08/24/2006			EXAMINER		
C. IRVIN N		LAND CCLELLAND, MAI	HENRY, M	HENRY, MICHAEL C		
1940 DUKE		SCEEDER II VD, IVII VI	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
ALEXANDI	RIA, VA	22314	1623	<u></u>		

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)		
10/701,495	GALEY, JEAN-BAPTIS	GALEY, JEAN-BAPTISTE		
Examiner	Art Unit			
Michael C. Henry	1623			

Potoro the Eiling of an Anneal Priof								
	Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
		Michael C. Henry	1623					
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE	REPLY FILED 22 May 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.					
1. [□ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
	The period for reply expires <u>6</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
b)	The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In one event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN							
have unde set fo may	TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 is ions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex r 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sorth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) ICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Offi	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as				
2. 🛭	The Notice of Appeal was filed on 22 May 2006. A brief in	n compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 m	ust be filed within two	months of the				
Δ N // E	date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or a appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply NDMENTS							
	The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered b	0001160				
J. <u>C</u>	(a) ⊠ They raise new issues that would require further co			ecaus e				
	(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	•	12 50.0117,					
	(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
	(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.					
	NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1	16 and 41.33(a)).						
4. 🛚	The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. 🛚	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)	:						
	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).	·		_				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an exp how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:								
	Claim(s) objected to:							
	Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-6 and 8-22</u> .							
.	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
	DAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	t before as an the data of filling a Ni	nting of Ammont will ma	t ha antarad				
). <u> </u>	The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	d sufficient reasons why the affiday	it or other evidence is	necessary and				
	The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	ls to provide a l).				
	☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation UEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.				
	The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	•	_	nce because:				
	Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). Other:		ATT 812	1/06				
		SHAOJIA AI SUPERVISORY	NNA JIANG, PH.D. Y PATENT EXAMIN					

Application No. 10/701,495

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Further examination and complete response to applicant's remarks and proposed amendments wherein the scope of the claim has been changed (i.e. the independent claim 1) and a new claim has been added, thus introducing new issues, requires extensive time for additional search and careful consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's proposed amendments/remarks have been considered but is not found to be persuasive...